UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
34th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 12 November 1991
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MROZIEWICZ (Poland)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on draft resolutions under all disarmament agenda items

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.34
20 November 1991

ENGLISH

91-61736 7319V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 47 TO 65 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Kheradi.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/46/L.7/Rev.1: Costa Rica and Uruguay;

A/C.1/46/L.11, L.12 and L.25: Costa Rica;

A/C.1/46/L.27: Argentina and Turkey;

A/C.1/46/L.9: China and Poland;

A/C.1/46/L.29: China;

A/C.1/46/L.25: Algeria and Ukraine;

A/C/1/46/L.14: Samoa;

A/C.1/46/L.17: Samoa, Cyprus and Venezuela;

A/C.1/46/L.23: Ecuador.

(Mr. Kheradi)

I should also like to bring to the Committee's attention some editorial changes that need to be made in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1.

First, in the eighth preambular paragraph the word "on" should be added after "particular", so that the paragraph will read:

"Welcoming all initiatives leading to general and complete disarmament, including in the region of the Middle East, and in particular on the establishment therein of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons".

Secondly, in operative paragraph 6 the word "from" after "free" should be replaced by "of", so that the paragraph will now read:

"Further invites all parties to consider the appropriate means that may contribute towards the goal of general and complete disarmament and the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the region of the Middle East".

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will proceed to take action on the following draft resolutions:

In cluster 4: A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1

In cluster 5: A/C.1/46/L.9

In cluster 8: A/C.1/46/L.7/Rev.1; L.12; L.21; L.25; L.27; L.29; and L.38.

Before the Committee takes a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1 in cluster 4, I call on the representative of Egypt to introduce it.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): The Middle East region is the cradle of civilization, a region rich in cultural heritage and enlightenment and the birthplace of three revealed religions expounding peace as a cornerstone of their spiritual message. Yet the Middle East has been the theatre of strife and armed conflict for over 40 years.

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

It would therefore seem timely, today more than ever before, in the light of dramatic recent developments, that we seriously embark on laying the solid foundations on which to proceed towards establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The consensus that has emerged in the General Assembly in respect of this proposal and the steadfast support it receives in various multilateral forums, as well as through unilateral declarations, is eloquent testimony to the credibility of this concept as a concrete measure.

The creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone would contribute greatly to deterring the proliferation of nuclear weapons, thereby strengthening the security of all States of the region. It would, moreover, eliminate the threat to international peace and security associated with any prospective nuclear-arms race that might develop in the Middle East. Consequently, it would be deemed an important confidence-building measure, indicative of the common will of all States of the region to live in peace.

During the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly, the "Study on effective and verifiable measures which would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East" was presented for the consideration of Member States. This study was generally well received as a useful and balanced approach to efforts to attain an important objective. In quoting this study, I would refer to its conclusions, where it states:

> "There clearly is no instant solution to the problem. There also is no doubt that the goal can be reached; it is not an ideal dream ...
>
> "The effort required will be great, but so will the benefits of success." (A/45/435, annex, paras. 175 and 176)

Though we fully realize that peace, security and stability in the region of the Middle East will be achieved only when a comprehensive, just and

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict is attained, it is necessary to create the climate that may facilitate this end result. In our view, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone would contribute substantially in this regard. It is important to emphasize that the zone should not be viewed as merely a subsidiary factor of the Middle East equation. On the contrary, the objectives that it serves are fundamental in their own right, by virtue of eliminating the threats posed by the nuclear dimension of an arms race in the Middle East region.

On this occasion, as on previous occasions, Egypt finds it necessary to reiterate what we regard as the fundamental prerequisites, namely: that all States of the region undertake equal legally binding commitments to relinquish the nuclear-weapon option; that all States of the region adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty and apply full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to their nuclear facilities; that appropriate and adequate measures by extraregional States, particularly nuclear-weapon States, be extended to the States of the region; that States of the region develop confidence-building measures in the nuclear field, especially those that would provide transparency of nuclear programmes; and that verification and control procedures necessary to guarantee compliance with the objectives made throughout the necessary stages for establishing the nuclear-weapon-free zone and thereafter be formulated and agreed upon by all parties concerned, and that these procedures provide the maximum degree of assurance for all States that their legitimate security concerns are met.

In introducing draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1, of 6 November 1991, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", I cannot overemphasize the importance Egypt attaches to the realization of this objective.

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

It is our considered opinion that the time is ripe to proceed to ascertain the elements of a possible agreement on the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. For this reason, operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution endeavours once again to utilize the good offices of the Secretary-General to inject impetus into the process. We are confident that the United Nations could play an instrumental role in achieving this important measure.

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

I wish also to draw attention to the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 6 in which reference is made to the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction.

It will be recalled that since the announcement of this initiative by President Mubarak on 8 April 1990, it has been attracting an ever-widening degree of support. The Security Council has adopted a resolution calling for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction. In their meeting in Paris last July, the five permanent members endorsed the call for the establishment of such a zone.

The integral relationship between this initiative and the establishment of a nuclear-weapon free zone in the Middle East is self-evident since the objective of both is to enhance the prospects of effective disarmament measures to eliminate the devasting consequences that weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, may inflict. It is our sincere hope that the States of the Middle East will work towards the implementation of both proposals simultaneously, in order to eliminate the shadows of suspicion over the capabilities of one type of mass destruction weapon or the other.

In conclusion, in introducing draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1, Egypt has taken care to preserve all the elements of resolutions of.previous years. Editorial updating has been incorporated only where necessary. The delegation of Egypt has conducted extensive consultations concerning the formulation of the draft resolution with all - I repeat: with all - delegations of the States of the Middle East and also with other interested parties who participated constructively in this regard.

I therefore commend this draft resolution to the First Committee and hope that it will receive the same support as on previous occasions and be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): I shall speak on behalf of the European Community and its 12 member States.

Under agenda item 54, the First Committee takes up the issue of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

The Twelve note that Egypt has called for the establishment of such a zone in resolutions since 1974. These resolutions have been adopted by consensus in the General Assembly for more than 10 years.

The Twelve are particularly happy that this year too the delegation of Egypt has introduced a draft resolution (A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1), which we hope will attract consensus. It is a well-balanced text dealing with an issue that has had a prominent place in our political agenda, especially this year.

In 1990, President Mubarak of Egypt suggested expanding the scope of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. He proposed that the Middle East should be declared a region free of all weapons of mass destruction, because the threats to the region had continued to grow as a result of the accumulation of arms in the region. This proposal was well received by the international community.

The Twelve believe that the early establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East would constitute an effective measure of non-proliferation and arms control.

If a zone free of weapons of mass destruction were established, this would be a major contribution towards, inter alia, the objective of a global ban on chemical weapons.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

In the longer term such a zone, to be real and effective, would have to be freely negotiated and agreed to by all parties in the region.

The Gulf crisis demonstrated to what extent excessive accumulation of arms, as well as proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and missiles capable of delivering those weapons, could endanger peace and security.

Security Council resolution 687 (1991) recalled the objective of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. It also pointed to the threat that all weapons of mass destruction pose to peace and security in the area, as well as to the need to work towards the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of such weapons.

The Twelve take note of the letter dated 21 July 1991 of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt addresssed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations concerning the recent proposals on arms limitation and disarmament in the Middle East. Mention could also be made of the declarations of the representatives of the five States permanent members of the Security Council concerning arms transfers and non-proliferation of July 1991 and October 1991.

The year 1991 has indeed been one in which quite a few initiatives were taken with implications for or concerning the Middle East.

A very important step would be for all States in the region to formalize their commitments to non-proliferation, for instance, by acceding to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.

Joining the NPT and accepting full scope safeguards could certainly diminish suspicions concerning nuclear programmes. It would also have a confidence-building effect.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

Full compliance with international obligations is necessary. There should be no fear of hidden nuclear arsenals or programmes. In this context, the Twelve commend the efforts undertaken by the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The validity and normative value of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention were reaffirmed in the Final Declaration adopted on 27 September 1991 by the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. That Declaration clearly stated the determination of States Parties to exclude completely the possibility of the use of bacteriological agents and toxins as weapons. States Parties also expressed their belief that universal adherence to the Convention would enhance international peace and security.

The Twelve would like to take this opportunity to call on all States in the region of the Middle East to become parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

As a biological weapons capability was clearly a possibility in the Middle East - witness the recent events in the Gulf - it appears to the Twelve that all States in the region should have a particularly keen interest in full accession to the Convention.

The Third Review Conference of the biological and toxin weapons Convention took the initiative of investigating the possibility and means of verification of the Convention. The Twelve welcome the establishment of an Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts, open to all States parties, to identify and examine potential verification measures from a scientific and technical standpoint.

The negotiations on a multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction are progressing steadily in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Indeed, part of the negotiators' mandate is that they should strive to achieve a final agreement on the convention in 1992. The Twelve fervently hope that all States in the Middle East will actively contribute to the negotiations and wil , in the end, accede to the convention.

Universal accession will be an important element for the convention. Accession by all States in the Middle East, an area where chemical weapons have been used on several occasions in the recent past, would contribute to the security of the region and of the world as a whole.

The call to make the Middle East a zone free of weapons of mass destruction merits full support from the international community. The Twelve are pleased that such a call is now also reflected in the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1. This paragraph goes even

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

further as, through its reference to general and complete disarmament, it involves conventional weapons also.

In conclusion, the Twelve express the hope that the Middle East will embark on the road of arms control and disarmament. The Madrid Conference demonstrated that all the parties involved in the Arab-Israel conflict can sit together at the conference table. Let us here in this forum do our share as well.

Mr. YATIV (Israel): For over a decade Israel has been proposing, and has joined others in proposing, a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Moreover, throughout the years, Israel has also joined the consensus of the General Assembly on this item, because it supports the general concept. This year, as well, Israel has chosen to join the consensus in spite of the introduction of some additional elements in the draft resolution. First of all, Israel wishes to register once again its traditional reservation concerning to the draft resolution, and to reiterate the modalities that it deems to be crucial: direct negotiations and mutually satisfactory arrangements in the first instance, to be supplemented thereafter by International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. In Israel's view, a credible nuclear-weapon-free zone agreed by the States of the region is a prerequisite for the removal of the danger of any further war. Israel wishes to renew its call for the implementation of this proposal and for basing it upon these modalities.

The additional elements introduced into this year's draft resolution include, inter alia, a new provision in the preamble, welcoming the establishment in the region of the Middle East of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. In this regard, Israel wishes to

(Mr. Yativ, Israel)

state once again its position that weapons of mass destruction are all those weapons that can kill civilians indiscriminately. They include an abundance of conventional weapons, as is recognized in a report by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly:

> "all the separate elements [nuclear capabilities, chemical weapons, conventional arms, political conflict] must be worked on concurrently, for it will not be possible to settle any one piece of the problem unless it is clear that progress is being made on the other pieces as well." (A/45/435, para. 151)

The Gulf war has borne out how true this is. It is now recognized that menacing quantities of conventional arms cannot be separated from other means of mass destruction. Israel faced an existential threat during the Gulf war, and it cannot blithely disregard the lessons of the recent past inasmuch as they pertain to its security. Therefore, I should like to emphasize that the phrase "towards the goal of general and complete disarmament", mentioned in both the preamble and operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1, applies to conventional weapons as well as to other types of weapons. Moreover, it should be correctly understood that this would entail a direct and free process of negotiations among the regional parties.

As regards the addition of operative paragraph 7, I wish to draw the attention of the First Committee to the incipient face-to-face talks that will hopefully provide a suitable forum also for dealing with arms-control issues. We believe that everything should be done to encourage negotiations among the States directly concerned, and that the United Nations, when considering further steps in the framework of this provision, should be mindful of "the evolving situation in the Middle East" - the words used in this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 12 November 1991.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsor of this draft resolution has expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1 was adopted.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. WATANABE (Japan): I wish to explain Japan's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", which was adopted yesterday, and on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.35/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", which has just been adopted.

It has always been the view of the Government of Japan that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, in South Asia and in Latin America - or in any other region for that matter - would contribute to the objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to the peace and security of the region in question.

At the same time, Japan considers that the establishment of such a zone would not contribute to the strengthening of the security of the region in question unless certain conditions were met. Let me enumerate some of the most basic conditions. The establishment of such a nuclear-weapon-free zone with appropriate verification measures should be agreed upon at the initiative of the countries in the region and with the voluntary consent of all the countries concerned, including the nuclear-weapon States. Also, a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be established in such a way that it would not jeopardize the peace and security of other regions and would be in accordance with the principles of international law. Furthermore, adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty by all the countries of the region in question would be highly desirable in creating such a zone.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 8: namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.7/Rev.1, L.12, L.21, L.25, L.27, L.29 and L.38, respectively.

The Committee will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.7/Rev.1, entitled "Study on charting potential uses of resources

(The Chairman)

allocated to military activities for civilian endeavours to protect the environment".

I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions before a decision is taken on the draft resolutions in cluster 8.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIASO (Italy): On behalf of the delegations of Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the United States and Italy, I have the honour to offer some reflections on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.21, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

The Conference on Disarmament operates on the basis of consensus. That is the way it is, and that is the way it should be. A considerable amount of time and effort is invested in achieving consensus in the Conference on Disarmament. The negotiations in that forum would not stand a realistic chance of success otherwise. The report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly reflects both a number of conclusions on which consensus in the Conference on Disarmament exists and many positions on which consensus is still absent. The report thus clearly presents a blend of divergent views and areas of agreement.

On the other hand, the General Assembly addresses its work, including all items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, by means of specific resolutions pertaining to the subject-matter of the respective items. The divergent views on the underlying issues come to the fore in specific drafts, in proposals, in negotiations, and, finally, in voting patterns. There is plenty of scope for expressing widely divergent views.

In our view, the consensus reached in the Conference on Disarmament on its annual report should have its echo in the General Assembly: adoption by a consensus resolution of a procedural nature.

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

Indeed, the various draft resolutions offer clear indications of the potential for negotiations on various items, but it is up to the Conference on Disarmament to decide on its own agenda.

There is no reason for controversy on what should be a purely procedural draft resolution of a general and non-controversial nature. It is not up to the General Assembly to resolve political differences that manifest themselves among the member States of the Conference on Disarmament.

The language in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.21 is controversial and is not helpful to the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

The delegations on whose behalf I have the honour of speaking express their regret at seeing a politicized draft resolution concerning the Conference on Disarmament put to a vote again this year. They will not be able to support it.

These delegations hope, however, that the spirit of consensus - essential for successful disarmament negotiations - will prevail and be reflected in the relevant resolution at the next General Assembly.

Mr. SHA Zukang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, I should like to make a combined statement on the principal elements of the Chinese delegation's position on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

In recent years, thanks to the joint efforts of people throughout the world, some positive changes have taken place in regard to disarmament. Nuclear and conventional disarmament has made some headway, and negotiations on a convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons have intensified steadily and have entered into a critical stage.

However, in the matter of preventing an arms race in outer space, the situation remains disappointing. At the Conference on Disarmament, this issue is still at the stage of general study and deliberation, and no agreement has been reached on a negotiating mandate. The countries with the largest space capabilities have not stopped their arms race in outer space, and no substantive progress has been made in their negotiations on space weapons. Furthermore, it seems that the goal of their bilateral negotiations is not the banning of space weapons. Not long ago, both sides expressed their readiness to discuss the limited deployment of non-nuclear defences to protect against

(Mr. Sha Zukang, China)

limited ballistic-missile strikes. This development cannot but cause the international community to closely examine the implications.

The weapons race in outer space constitutes a qualitative escalation of the arms race and poses a threat to international peace and security. Prevention of an arms race has therefore become a task of great urgency. At a time when the entire international community is making every effort to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction on Earth, it is all the more imperative to prevent the arms race from extending into outer space.

Outer space belongs to all mankind and should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and for the well-being of mankind. Space weapons must therefore be absolutely prohibited. The countries with the largest space capabilities should bear special responsibilities and take the lead in adopting earnest measures for the immediate cessation of the production, testing, manufacture and deployment of space weapons, including anti-ballistic missiles and anti-satellite weapons. They should negotiate seriously on this basis with a view to reaching an agreement on the complete prohibition of all space weapons.

Like most countries, China has always maintained that the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body, should immediately establish an ad hoc committee with a negotiating mandate and conclude an international convention on the complete prohibition of space weapons as soon as possible.

For several consecutive years the Chinese delegation has worked with non-aligned and other countries for the adoption by this Committee of a single draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, to reflect the universal desire and common aspiration of the international community with

(Mr. Sha Zukang, China)

respect to this important issue. The Chinese delegation appreciates the efforts and cooperation rendered by all sides.

In view of the fact that the basic objective and intent of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, proposed by the non-aligned group, are basically in keeping with our position, the Chinese delegation has co-sponsored and will support this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.7/Rev.1, in cluster 8.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.7/Rev.1 has six sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee, on 11 November 1991.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.7/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.12.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will read out the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.12 has six sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1991. The sponsors are as follows: Bolivia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Mexico, Myanmar and Sri Lanka.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.12 was adopted by 98 votes to 6, with 30 abstentions.*

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Rwanda and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Italy had intended to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.21.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.21 has 25 sponsors, and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Algeria, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.21 was adopted by 104 votes to 8, with 24 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25 has 25 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Algeria, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Jordan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Myanmar, Nigeria, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Ukraine, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25.

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Burundi, Rwanda and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tansania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 9 was retained by 107 votes to 1, with 26 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Rwanda and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, as a whole, was adopted by 135 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Rwanda and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27 has 35 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.29.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.29 has 12 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Peru, Spain and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.29 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38 was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka, at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991, on behalf of the Member States of the United Nations which are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

This draft resolution also has programme budget implications, submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, and these are contained in document A/C.1/46/L.44.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38 was adopted by 102 votes to 4, with 28 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): I wish to explain the votes of my delegation on two draft resolutions just adopted by this committee. They are draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.12, "Comprehensive programme of disarmament", and A/C.1/46/L.38, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Rwanda and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

Zone of Peace". My delegation found it necessary to abstain in the votes on both of these draft resolutions.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.12, my delegation supports the concept embodied in it - that is, a comprehensive approach to disarmament issues. However, in view of the considerable differences which exist among the members of the Conference on Disarmament on this subject, we are not convinced of the value of annually seeking the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament on the Comprehensive Programme on Disarmament. Since there is no prospect of this proposal being agreed, it serves no useful purpose in our view to repeat this resolution, unchanged, every year. It would be preferable to seek agreement among the members of the Conference on Disarmament on an approach which could command consensus. We hope that such an approach will be adopted in next year's text, thus enabling us to renew our affirmative vote.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38, my delegation continues to support the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. We have followed the work of the Ad Hoc Committee with close attention. We note that some progress has been made, but there are still considerable differences among the parties concerned on the holding of the Conference on this subject in 1993.

My delegation believes that to be successful this Conference would have to have the support and participation of all the parties concerned. Since there is no agreement among the parties on this subject, my delegation considers premature the provisions of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38, which call for the organization of the Conference, including a request to the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for holding it. It would

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

be preferable in our view if agreement could be reached among the parties concerned before the preparations for the Colombo Conference were initiated, and for that reason my delegation abstained in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): While my delegation has joined the consensus by which draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27, "Transparency of military expenditures", was adopted without a vote, I should like to state the following in explanation of my delegation's position.

Pakistan has always supported in principle the ultimate goal of the proposal regarding objective information on military matters. In our view, however, the collection of information on military matters concerning all States could create potential problems for smaller and militarily weaker States. The availability of information on military matters through an international reporting system can work against the security interests of smaller States. While these States may not essentially benefit from the information they receive regarding the military capability of bigger States, information concerning themselves as smaller and weaker States could be used to their disadvantage by bigger States seeking regional or global hegemony or influence.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

The Disarmament Commission has been examining the question of military budgets since 1979. Efforts have been made over the past years to evolve a set of principles that would govern the actions of States in freezing and reducing military budgets. In our view, adopting arbitrary criteria to freeze or cut military spending without addressing the security concerns of States is not realistic. The recommendations evolved by the Disarmament Commission must, in particular, give due consideration to the security concerns of small, developing and non-aligned States and their regional security perspectives. The wide disparity between the armaments expenditure of militarily strong States and the other States cannot be justified either. The reduction of military budgets, therefore, should be initiated by those States which possess the largest military arsenals.

Finally, it would be more feasible and equitable to link the reduction of military expenditure with force reductions which provide for cuts in the number of men and machines. A similar approach is outlined in paragraphs 89 and 90 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. There is a great need to initiate ways and means to implement that decision.

Mr. WATANABE (Japan): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". Although Japan supports in principle the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean, it believes that there should be prior harmonization of views among the countries concerned, in particular on the basic substantive issues. Japan regrets that the draft resolution which has just been adopted does not show any attempt to attain this goal, but tries to proceed to the organization of the Conference. Japan cannot agree to this attempt or to some elements of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Watanabe, Japan)

Japan therefore had no choice but to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States has asked to speak in order to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". The United States voted against paragraph 9 of that draft resolution and then abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

We voted against paragraph 9 because we have not yet identified any issues appropriate for outer-space-arms-control negotiations in any form, except for those issues under consideration in the bilateral nuclear and space talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. But paragraph 9 survived and we thus abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, because paragraph 9 and other language in the draft resolution could be interpreted as suggesting that the United States was modifying this judgement. The United States is willing, of course, to join its colleagues in the Conference on Disarmament in seeking to enhance understanding of the many complex issues related to disarmament and outer space.

Mr. SHAH (India): I have asked to speak in order to place on record the views of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27, which has just been adopted by consensus.

Transparency and openness are necessary as confidence-building measures as a matter of general principle. While India supports transparency, my delegation believes that transparency is not an end in itself and that transparency per se should not become the ultimate objective. Transparency is important if it is considered as a vehicle for achieving the objective of general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Shah, India)

India will indeed be providing available information on military expenditure in the hope that this will be a universal exercise in which all States Members of the United Nations will participate. For a reporting system to be useful and to serve the intended purpose of confidence building, it would need to be universally complied with.

My delegation also sees the standardized reporting system as an evolving exercise. The reporting system and format must be reviewed with a view to constant improvement and necessary fine-tuning. I should like to recall that the Ad Hoc Panel of Experts that finalized the instrument in 1980 admitted in its report that some parts of the instrument might call for further examination. We believe, for example, that the reporting format should also reflect military expenditure in per capita terms and in proportion to the gross domestic product of each country, in order to put military expenditure in the proper perspective.

My delegation hopes that the sponsors of the draft resolution will take these points into consideration when presenting the draft resolution on this subject next year.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): Australia abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38. Nevertheless, we are strongly supportive of the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and, as States are aware, Australia has sought to play a constructive and active role in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, to which this draft resolution refers.

We are not convinced that the course of action outlined in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38 offers us a practical or realistic approach. In part, this stems from overly high expectations and a controversial approach to the funding of such a conference, but largely it relates to the fact that the

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

draft resolution does not reflect in any true sense what has taken place, not just over the last year but in the last few years, in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Australia is acutely aware of the most vigorous attempts that States participating in the Ad Hoc Committee have made to seek new approaches and new avenues in order to reinvigorate and bolster that Committee. Regrettably, all such attempts have failed because of differing perceptions about the direction of future work. Unless the members of the Ad Hoc Committee can agree on a new direction, the work of the Committee will remain effectively stalemated. Accordingly, the proposal for further meetings made in paragraph 12 seems to offer only the possibility of further division rather than a consensual preparatory approach to a conference.

For over 20 years the Preparatory Committee has been working to finalize the procedural issues necessary before a conference can be held. Although we are not convinced that draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38 will advance the course further, we do hope that the remaining procedural issues can be quickly resolved and that finally the Indian Ocean can be established as a zone of peace.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): I should like, on behalf of the European Community and its member States, to give an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25, which is entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space".

The Twelve note that, again, the combined efforts of various delegations made possible the submission of a draft resolution that could be supported by all States members of the European Community. This continued last year's welcome pattern, which represented a break with the tradition by which each of three regional groups and one State presented its own draft. In view of the efforts to rationalize the work of the First Committee, this is a positive development.

In the opinion of the Twelve, the new pattern reflects the importance of the prevention of an arms race in outer space and is an encouraging sign that the work at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament on this subject will be continued. Indeed, the work of the Conference on Disarmament this year, under the able Presidency of Ambassador Garcia Moritan of Argentina, has resulted in a spirited and in-depth discussion of a great number of items. This, combined with the more constructive approach by delegations, has proved to be the best way of moving forward in respect of this highly complex subject, which involves a multitude of technical issues.

The Twelve note that operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25 did not command consensus. This is for reasons that relate to differences of view on the constitutional aspects of the relationship between the United Nations and the Conference on Disarmament, including the way in which the Conference on Disarmament conducts its work. The Twelve would have been happier if it had been possible to find a format that enabled operative paragraph 9 to command consensus.

Mr. RIVERO del ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27, but we want to state for the record that, had the draft resolution been put to a vote, we would have abstained. As representatives know, the delegation of Cuba did not support resolution 35/142 B of 12 December 1980, by which the standardized system of reporting information on military expenditures was introduced. My delegation continues to believe that the provision of information on military expenditures does not facilitate the achievement of what, it will be recalled, some countries saw as the objective of this system - namely, a reduction of military budgets.

In addition, my delegation continues to feel that the question of information on military expenditures - or, as it is now called, transparency of military expenditures - does not take into account the security requirements of small countries threatened by the arsenals of countries that pursue hostile policies and whose military expenditures are enormous. Undoubtedly, transparency can be valuable when States behave in such a way as to create confidence and take steps to reduce tension and conflict.

Mr. SHOUKRY (Egypt): I should like to explain Egypt's position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27, which is entitled "Transparency of military expenditures". My delegation was willing to go along with the consensus on the draft resolution. However, had a recorded vote been taken, my delegation would have abstained and, thus, reaffirmed its previous position in respect of this item. It continues to be our view that addressing the issue of the military expenditures of States in isolation from security concerns will not yield the positive results that are desired.

Mr. AL-BATTASHI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to explain my country's position in respect of the action on draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.27 and L.29.

My delegation joined the consensus in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27 although it believes that the concept of objectivity that the draft resolution seeks would lead to a weakening of the concept of national security of small States. On the other hand, we believe that, primarily, the reduction of military outlays should be made the responsibility of the major Powers.

As for draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.29, we believe it would deprive the small countries from improving their ability with regard to the acquisition of sophisticated technology. We view the draft resolution as politicised and does not take into account, in the first instance, the aspirations of small States. Had a recorded vote been taken, we would have abstained.

Mr. LIM (Singapore): I refer to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27. My delegation was willing to go along with the consensus, but had the draft resolution been put to a vote it would have abstained.

Mr. AL-FAIHANI (Bahrain) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation participated in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27, but had the draft been put to a recorded vote it would have abstained.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions in cluster 6: A/C.1/46/L.17, A/C.1/46/L.22, and A/C.1/46/L.32.

I call on the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I have the privilege to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32, entitled "Regional disarmament", on behalf of its 44 sponsors: Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Germany, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Italy, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mali, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela.

Since its inception the United Nations has provided the focal point for the international community in its effort to promote the maintenance of international peace and security, through disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the promotion of international cooperation in diverse spheres. From the very beginning, disarmament emerged as a major factor in

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

the achievement of global peace and security. In the contemporary global scene, characterized by the end of ideological confrontation between the East and the West, disarmament stands at the heart of all efforts for the furtherance of the goal of international peace and security.

The recent conclusion of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union constitutes a landmark in the arms-reduction talks between the two super-Powers. The recent announcement by President Bush and President Gorbachev of bold and far-reaching measures, encompassing, among other things, the elimination of land- and sea-based tactical nuclear weapons, represents major progress towards nuclear disarmament. These steps also portend a promising future characterized by an increasing spirit of mutual cooperation and understanding.

There is a growing recognition in the world today that many security problems and preoccupations of States can be accorded fuller consideration in the regional context, where remedial measures which are suitable to specific regional conditions can be designed. The success of the Conference on Security and Cooperation (CSCE) process in Europe, which resulted in the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), bears testimony to the idea that regional consultations offer the best and most relevant answers to many of the problems of security and arms control. We hope that the new momentum towards greater confidence, security and cooperation in Europe will also give a boost to regional efforts in other parts of the world.

The tragic conflict in the Gulf has added a special sense of urgency to the objectives of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, disarmament and confidence-building in various regions of the world. It is in this context

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

that the arms-control and disarmament proposals made recently, including those made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan and the President of Egypt, hold special importance for the South Asian and Middle East regions. We are also encouraged by the progress achieved in Latin America in this regard.

We all agree that a global response to disarmament must continue to be pursued sincerely. It is imperative that, simultaneously with global efforts, collective endeavours be made by all countries at the regional level to promote disarmament, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and confidence-building measures, wherever and whenever possible. These measures must, of course, take into account the specific characteristics of each region and be made with the free agreement of the States concerned.

Our draft resolution, which is on the same lines as last year's resolution 45/58 P, treats these elements together in a comprehensive manner, neither singling out nor excluding any one of them. It therefore has equal relevance and applicability to all regions now, as in the future. It complements the existing global efforts and existing arrangements, and in no way undermines any of them.

We hope that the draft resolution, whose forerunner was adopted last year by an overwhelming majority, will receive even wider support this year.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their position on draft resolutions in the cluster.

Mr. DUNAY (Hungary): I should like to take this opportunity to make known my delegation's view on the role of regional disarmament and confidence-building measures, questions which are dealt with in several draft

(Mr. Dunay, Hungary)

resolutions in cluster 6 - in particular, those contained in documents A/C.1/46/L.17 and A/C.1/46/L.22.

The Hungarian delegation has asked to speak at this phase of the Committee's deliberations to indicate its strong commitment to the subjects under consideration. In addition, we find it very important to pay due attention to these two issues, not only because we have actively supported the relevant draft resolutions, but for other reasons as well.

It is, first, the very nature of regional disarmament and confidence-building measures that makes these issues indispensable and nearly omnipresent at all disarmament forums. This can be easily seen if we cast a glance at the verbatim records of our previous meetings. We cannot find any delegation that has failed to mention - or, rather, elaborate on - its region's disarmament concerns or its plans for enhancing confidence at the regional level.

The importance of any disarmament effort has always been determined by the fact that the notion or perception of security can be felt or conceived, first, at a regional level. It is generally at this level that the arms race is fuelled and tensions are most likely to lead to conflicts. It follows that if we are to prevent an arms race and avoid the threat of war we should first help make order, or, more exactly, build confidence and carry out disarmament efforts in our own region.

(Mr. Dunay, Hungary)

We are well aware that any regional effort can only be an element in creating global security and not a substitute for it, and any regional approach to disarmament has to take into account the specific conditions and characteristics of the region. We are convincedd that it would be a mistake to impose the experiences of a region upon other regions having different conditions.

Recent historic events would have been inconceivable without the help of previously introduced confidence-building measures. These measures, real arms reduction and effective verification have become the three main elements of the European disarmament process. During the realization of these elements it became obvious to all European countries that our regional disarmament effort can only be considered really successful if it guarantees that arms reductions in Europe are not leading to an increased level of armaments in other regions.

Without going into further detail, we can certainly conclude that - as the delegations of Finland and Canada put it in their general statements - regional disarmament in Europe is working. Despite this positive conclusion we cannot be entirely satisfied or complacent

Recent events have strikingly demonstrated that the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) process, our regional confidence-building and conflict prevention efforts, could not make Europe immune to armed conflicts. Consequently, we have a pressing need for improving the efficiency of the CSCE institutions as well as the conflict prevention mechanism in such a way as was correctly outlined, about two weeks ago, by the delegation of Austria.

Our first lesson to be drawn from the current situation is that regional disarmament, namely the CSCE process, can be really effective only if the non-military aspects of security are duly taken care of as well. In our view,

(Mr. Dunay, Hungary)

today, when East-West rivalry has ceased to feed antagonisms, the real immediate threat to a region's security is no longer the military one. It is the increasing economic hardships and intolerant nationalism against neighbours and national minorities that foment hostilities and pose a dangerous threat to regional security. The best way of removing this threat is our insistence on full democracy, human rights, fundamental freedoms, the rule of law and a market economy.

We are of the opinion that our regional problems are due in part to the fact that the conventional forces in Europe negotiations and the whole CSCE process were initiated and conceived in a Cold War context; therefore, sometimes it is difficult for us to respond to the new security challenges and abandon thinking in old terms and to take fully into account the radically different nature of the new security challenges, as well as to build our security approach and measures on cooperation and mutual understanding, putting aside our differences and eventual confrontation.

Having gained concrete experiences during the recent crisis, CSCE member States are well aware of the institutional and functional shortcomings and are doing their utmost to strengthen CSCE institutions and, first of all, to enhance the role of the Conflict Prevention Centre. It is, in our view, a must that the several European organizations cooperate more closely in conflict prevention and that the United Nations also get more directly involved in these efforts as well.

We hope that by realizing these proposals the CSCE community will be able to find a solution to our pressing regional security problem. For this hope to become a reality, it is imperative, in our view, that the United Nations give further impetus to the European crisis-management process.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/'C.1/46/L.17.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.17, sponsored by 50 delegations, was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 26th meeting of the First Committee on 5 November 1991. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.17 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.22.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.22, sponsored by 35 delegations, was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 29th meeting of the Committee, on 6 November 1991. The list of sponsors reads as follows: Albania, Austria,

(Mr. Kheradi)

Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.22 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32 has 45 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 34th meeting of the Committee on 12 November 1991. The list of sponsors reads as follows: Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Germany, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Italy, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mali, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bhutan, Cuba, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32 was adopted by 130 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. RIVERO del ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The Cuban delegation wishes to explain its vote on certain draft resolutions that refer to regional disarmament which have been submitted to the Committee for

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Rwanda and Zaire advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Rivero del Rosario, Cuba)

its decision. In this regard, we wish to acknowledge the work carried out by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.17 and, in particular, the delegation of Belgium, which endeavoured to incorporate into the draft resolution the various comments on the important question of regional disarmament, including confidence-building measures, made by certain delegations, inter alia, the Cuban delegation, last year and during this session. Our delegation appreciates the incorporation into this year's text of such new elements as the need for regional disarmament measures to be aimed at establishing a military balance at the lowest level, while not diminishing the security of each State and the need to eliminate the possibility of surprise attacks and large-scale offensive action. The importance of regional disarmament measures taken at the initiative of States of the region and with the participation of all States concerned and taking into account the specific characteristics of each region, in accordance with the principles of the Charter and in compliance with international law, is a positive element that has been included in the operative part of the draft resolution. That is why my delegation has joined the consensus on this draft resolution. None the less, Cuba believes that in future the draft could be improved even further. In particular, we should include a paragraph, which would highlight the need for States outside the region that have military installations or bases in the region to participate in negotiations in order to include such installations in the regional process. Respect by those States outside the region for regional measures is no doubt of great importance.

Moreover, we believe that in regional disarmament measures special attention should be paid to offensive weapons that have destabilizing effects. We think that the adoption of confidence-building measures can help

(Mr. Rivero del Rosario, Cuba)

to reduce or eliminate hotbeds of tension and conflict that still persist and can facilitate the adoption of agreements.

As to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32, our delegation was compelled to abstain because it does not include some of the elements just referred to, which we consider important.

Mr. SHAH (India): India has been generally supportive of proposals submitted in the Committee and in the United Nations concerning confidence-building measures and viable acceptable regional disarmament proposals that emanate voluntarily from all concerned States in the region after due consultation. This is evident from the fact that India has joined in the consensus achieved on draft resolutions A/C/1/46/L.17 and A/C.1/46/L.22. Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32 does not fall in this category. It combines ideas and approaches that are unrelated and seeks to place them within the ambit of the subject of regional disarmament. My delegation has already had occasion, in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30 concerning a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, to explain its position of principle on non-proliferation and to point out that regional or subregional nuclear-weapon-free zones do not contribute to the solution of the global issue of nuclear proliferation. All that draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32 does is to introduce flawed perceptions about regional proliferation and subregional proliferation, which in my delegation's view, distort the concept of regional disarmament. My delegation has therefore been compelled to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32.

Mr. FUJITA (Brazil): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32, which has just been adopted. Brazil voted in favour of this draft resolution as it voted in favour of other

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

draft resolutions concerned with regional disarmament, because it believes that regional initiatives, under appropriate conditions and with the participation of all the countries concerned, have an important role to play in the strengthening of international peace and security. In this regard, we should like to point out that disarmament efforts at the regional level should be in tandem with such efforts at the global level, particularly when the priority of nuclear disarmament is at issue. Moreover, measures related to regional security should take into account the particular characteristics and needs of the regions to which they refer. While initiatives in one region may constitute useful examples and stimuli for other regional efforts, it may not be possible to transplant them automatically from one region to another. It is important to make special efforts regarding regions with very high concentrations of armaments. We note that some of the elements in the text of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32, which the Committee has just adopted, could have been further improved, and we regret that it has not been possible to incorporate some of the suggestions made by interested delegations with a view to improving the text. We hope that in future fuller consideration will be given to those suggestions so that an even more broadly supported draft resolution can be adopted.

Mr. SHA Zukang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.17. China attaches great importance to the issue of regional disarmament and maintains that appropriate measures of regional disarmament taken by countries concerned in the light of the specific characteristics of each region are not only conducive to regional peace, security and stability, but also have a positive impact on international peace and security as a whole.

(Mr. Sha Zukang, China)

China also believes that appropriate confidence-building measures, including the exchange of military information, conducted with due regard for the specific circumstances of the countries in the regions concerned, are of positive significance. Measures of this kind should be adopted on a voluntary basis and through consultations among the countries concerned, taking into consideration their security environment and political and military conditions.

In the light of these considerations, the Chinese delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.17.

Mr. TRUNG (Viet Nam): The delegation of Viet Nam asked to speak to explain Viet Nam's position on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32, entitled "Regional disarmament", which has just been adopted by the Committee. This year, the Government of Viet Nam has decided to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Viet Nam's support for this text stems from its conviction that the new developments in international relations and the new disarmament achievements have not only created new favourable conditions for greater success but also call for greater efforts in the field of disarmament to consolidate international security and release extra resources for the development endeavours of all nations.

Viet Nam believes that, if pursued with the aim of achieving the goal of general and complete disarmament, disarmament measures undertaken at the regional level can complement those taken at the global level.

Viet Nam's positive vote for this draft resolution was also prompted by the positive changes that are unfolding in South-East Asia and reflect its willingness, together with the other countries of South-East Asia, to prevent an arms race and to build confidence, stability and cooperation in the region.

(Mr. Trung, Viet Nam)

As it has stated on other occasions, Viet Nam believes that, in order to be successful, efforts aimed at regional disarmament should be based upon the following principles:

Regional disarmament should be carried out in accordance with the principles for disarmament negotiations adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament which, among other things, provide that effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority and the nuclear-weapon States have the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and, together with other militarily significant States, for halting and reversing the arms race.

Efforts to promote regional disarmament should take into account the specific characteristics of each region, should have the agreement of the countries concerned in the region, and should accord with the principle of undiminished security at the lowest level of armaments.

Disarmament can be carried out only in a climate of confidence in its various aspects: political, economic, military, cultural and humanitarian. Countries outside a region should refrain from any policy or action detrimental to the climate of confidence in the region. Rather, they should, within their capability, actively contribute to the enhancement of confidence in the region.

Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea): My delegation asked to speak to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.17 and A/C.1/46/L.22, which have just been adopted by consensus, and on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32 for which we voted in favour.

My delegation supported these draft resolutions in the belief that regional and global approaches to disarmament complement each other in the promotion of regional and international peace and security.

(Mr. Lee, Republic of Korea)

Our support for all of these draft resolutions also reflects our consistent position that confidence-building measures or confidence- and security-building measures constitute the most important element in our approach to regional disarmament, especially in the regions where long-standing tensions and conflicts persist. In this regard, specific conditions and characteristics of the region are important dimensions to be taken into account.

As my delegation stated during the Committee's general debate, the emphasis on regional confidence-building measures, political as well as military, is particularly timely and warranted in the Asia-Pacific region. We note that, in the case of Europe, confidence building contributed to regional peace and security through a step-by-step process.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions on the draft resolution.

Mr. TOTH (Hungary): We have only recently concluded the Third Review Conference of the States parties to the biological and toxin weapons Convention and a thorough analysis always requires a certain distance in time. Still, we do not have to be afraid of stating at this moment, when the First Committee is to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9, devoted to the Third Review Conference, that the Conference proved to be an undeniable success.

I think most representatives share the view that multilateral disarmament is in desperate need of such positive accomplishments. Apart from the tangible results of the Third Review Conference of the biological weapons

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

Convention, it was the cooperative spirit and open-minded approach of delegations that gave us good reason to have faith in the future prospects of the biological disarmament regime.

After three weeks of intensive work, the Conference fulfilled its objective of conducting a comprehensive review of the functioning of the biological weapons convention. The Convention, unique in its nature in the multilateral field, in eliminating an entire class of weapons of mass destruction, has been reinforced as an efficient international instrument with respect to biological weapons and as a valid contribution to international peace and security.

The Review Conference carried out the third analysis of the experience gained in the implementation of the data-reporting system and agreed on a new package that, it is to be hoped, will give way to more effective data reporting. However, even the most sophisticated set of confidence-building measures can only serve the envisaged purposes if States parties live up to their commitments to participate actively.

We welcome the decision of the Third Review Conference to set up an ad hoc group of governmental experts to study the issues related to verification.

This step might be an important event in the history of the biological weapons Convention. The active and constructive participation of the States parties in the work of the group is a prerequisite for the early fulfilment of the mandate given to the group by the Third Review Conference.

It would be helpful if participating States could provide drafts of their position papers well in advance of the meeting. Even first drafts would provide a useful indication of the various options likely to be available to the group of governmental experts.

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

Certainly the work of the expert group must take into account the specific nature of activities in the fields of biology and biotechnology and the incredible speed with which these sciences are progressing. I am convinced that the overwhelming spirit of cooperation, flexibility and open-minded consideration will endure throughout the coming months and will enable the group of experts to carry out meaningful work. We hope this spirit will be expressed in the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9 by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions before the decision is taken.

We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9 has 27 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 27th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1991. The sponsors of the draft resolution are as follows: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, Uruguay, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Romania, the Republic of Korea and China. I also wish to draw the attention of the Committee to a note from the Secretariat concerning the responsibilities entrusted to the Secretary-General under draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9, as contained in document A/C.1/46/16.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly?

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9 was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.